

REMARKS

This filing is submitted in reply to the Response to the Notice of Improper Request for Continued Examination mailed November 19, 2007, and in response to a telephone conference with Examiner Michael Keefer. The Applicant thanks Examiner Keefer for his assistance in determining the correct response to be file in this situation.

A first response to the Response to the Notice of Improper Request for Continued Examination was filed on January 28, 2008. Examiner Keefer, after consultation with individuals at the USPTO, determined that a complete response should include a new Amendment Response and a new RCE filing. It should be noted that a

This is to be done even though the Applicant previously filed a response to the Notice of Improper Request for Continued Examination on January 28, 2008.

Therefore, in a supplemental response to the Notice of Improper Request for Continued Examination the Applicant encloses herewith:

- (1) a copy of the Notice of Improper Request for Continued Examination
- (2) a new Office Action Response
- (3) a new RCE filing
- (4) payment for the RCE (please note, a Petition for Extension of Time and payment for same was previously filed in this case on January 28, 2008).

RESPONSE

The Examiner has argued that the Applicant's arguments in the response dated October 29, 2007 because the Examiner asserts the claims do not specify zones may be of different sizes. The Applicant has amended claims 1 and 7 to clarify that the zones

created using the Applicant's claimed invention do not need to be of equal size as is required in the Peloquin reference.

The Examiner also argues that the Tawil reference teaches that the zoning plan dictates which devices can see each other. However, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's conclusion. Specifically, while it is true that Tawil teaches that devices in the same zone can see each other and that devices in different zones cannot, the Applicant's claimed invention does not require all devices within a zone to be able to see each other. It is possible in the Applicant's claimed invention for devices within the same zone to not be able to see each other, and selectively for some devices in separate zones to be able to see each other.

Accordingly the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicant asserts that claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 9-11 are allowable over the prior art. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

The Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's representative as listed below for a telephonic interview if so doing would expedite the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory Scott Smith
Reg. No. 38,309
Tel: (510) 742-7417
Fax: (510) 742-7419

GSS Law Group
3900 Newpark Mall road, Third Floor
Newark, CA 94560